

U.S. Appln. No. 10/828,989  
Response to Restriction Requirements dated March 6, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 14, 2006  
Page 7 of 7

### REMARKS

Claims 13-16 have been amended to state that they are process claims dependent from Claim 1. This corrects a typographical error. Claim 9 has been amended with support for the amendment being found on page 34, line 6. Claim 17 has been added to provide applicants fullest protection to which they are entitled. Finally, the specification has been amended to delete a duplicate paragraph (see paragraph 87). No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

The Examiner has required a restriction between Claims 1-12 in Group I and Claims 13-16 in Group II. The Examiner states that Claims 1-12 are drawn to a process and Claims 13-16 are drawn to a catalyst. Applicants elect Claims 1-12 with traverse. Claims 13-16 have been amended to state they are process claims and dependent on Claim 1. In view of these amendments, applicants assert that the restriction requirement has been rendered moot and respectfully request that it be withdrawn and Claims 1-16 be examined.

The Examiner has also stated that Claim 1 is generic, but several patentably distinct species are claimed. Applicants elect the species "alkylation of aromatics" set forth in Claims 1 and 2. Claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 13-17 read on "alkylation of aromatics". Applicants reserve the right to file continuation applications based on the non-elected species. Finally, applicants request that upon allowance of the elected species, all non-elected species be rejoined into the application and also be allowed.

Applicants state that all issues raised by the Office Action of 14 February 2006 have been addressed, but if the Examiner has questions regarding this response, he is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank S. Molinaro  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 32,710  
(847) 391-2031 (phone)  
(847) 391-2387 (fax)

FSM/mml